

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Garrod's Second Book of Manilius *Manili Astronomicon Liber II*. Edidit H. W. Garrod. Pp. xcix + 166. Oxford University Press, 1911.

Walter C. Summers

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 02 / March 1913, pp 60 - 61
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00004583, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00004583

How to cite this article:

Walter C. Summers (1913). The Classical Review, 27, pp 60-61 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00004583

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

GARROD'S SECOND BOOK OF MANILIUS.

Manili Astronomicon Liber II. Edidit
H. W. GARROD. Pp. xcix + 166.
Oxford University Press, 1911.

MR. GARROD has selected for treatment the hardest and dullest book of the *Astronomica*. It is the book in which, after the comparatively easy and interesting introduction to astronomy given in the first book, we suddenly plunge into the intricacies of astrology proper, to learn that Taurus is one of the 'feminine' signs, that signs which correspond to the angles of equilateral triangles, rectangles and hexagons inscribed in the circle of the Zodiac can influence each other, that signs otherwise situated may 'gaze at,' 'listen to' or 'love' one another by the rules of 'parallel association,' that besides the dodecatemory there exists the dodecatemory of the dodecatemory, and that our lives are affected by the cardinal points and the twelve regions of the Circle of Geniture. It was no easy task to write of these things in Latin verse, and it is no easy task to make intelligible to English readers the Latin verse in which they were ultimately written. Mr. Garrod has discharged it manfully. He has given us an excellent prose translation, thoroughly readable¹ and never really obscure. I say 'never really obscure,' because it was inevitable that in rendering such Latin at all closely he was bound to write some sentences that call for careful reading and hard thinking. What, for instance, can be done when your author chooses to represent an equilateral triangle inscribed in a circle by such words as these?

circulus extremo signorum ut clauditur orbe,
in tris aequalis discurrit linea ductus
inque uicem extremis iungit se finibus ipsa
(273-5.)

'At the last point in the Zodiac, where its course closes, the line of the Circle runs off into three equal straight

¹ At l. 246 surely the rendering of 'Aries in cornua tortus' as 'the Ram that twists his neck on to his horns' is due to some accident. The analogy of *irasci in cornua* (suggested in the note) might justify the translation 'that turns his head to butt with his horns.'

lines and joins itself to three points in the circumference which are each the furthest point possible from one another.' So our editor translates, and the sense is made clear by the note on 274: M.'s idea is that the circular line which forms the Zodiac suddenly becomes a straight one and proceeds to form in succession the sides of an equilateral triangle having its angles situated on the circle. Sometimes however the translation is itself a commentary as in ll. 216, 217 where the dreadful lines *cetera nec numero dissortia nec uice sedis | interiecta locis totidem nocturna feruntur* are most carefully rendered: 'The other signs, which are like the diurnal signs in that they are numerical pairs, and like them in that in position they are alternate pairs, fill the gaps left by the six diurnal signs, and are called nocturnal.' The commentary itself seems to me a model one, missing no difficulties and shedding light on everything with clearness and yet brevity.² The 'figures' are particularly useful, often revealing at a glance what a page of description might have failed to explain. If one could carp at anything, it would be at the frequency with which certain easy-going and inadequate editors of the *Astronomica* are censured. But the dullness of their task seems to compel editors of this poet to relieve themselves by fiery coruscations of this kind, and one who does his work as thoroughly as Mr. Garrod may well be allowed some license in this respect. I at least, as one who has tried to read the *Astronomica* with the help of the latest German commentary, cannot feel that anything said about the latter in this book is not well deserved.

² But I cannot accept the view expressed in the note on l. 255, that in *Ou. M.* 3. 186 *sgq. in latus obliquum tamen adstitit* means that Diana, when Actaeon surprised her, 'threw herself into a swimming posture, immersing herself and splashing water into Actaeon's face.' That the usual version 'stood sideways' is correct is made certain by *tamen*, which refers to the previous line, *quamquam comitum turba est stipata suorum*: although her nymphs crowded round to protect her nakedness, she instinctively turned aside.

Mr. Garrod has the gift of writing in an interesting way on matters textual, and has himself contributed over thirty emendations to the text which faces his version. Two-thirds of them come in the second half of the book. Some are rather bold, as e.g. in 619 (*creatus* for *trigono*) and 892 (*cingens fulmina* for *contingent fulmina*). But the text of Manilius is admittedly a πῆμα τοῦτων and in practically every case emendation of some kind is obviously necessary. I should have thought however that in 433 sqq. the punctuation 'his animaduersis rebus, quae proxima cura | noscere, etc., 'the task that comes next is to learn . . .', would have rendered the change of *rebus* to *debes* unnecessary. Is such a construction too cramped for a poet who writes (444) *uenantem uirum sed partis equinae* for 'the huntsman that is half horse'?

The Introductions deal with the manuscripts, the composition and condition of the poem, and the editions. The claim of M. to be regarded as a member of the 'better family' is asserted, not without protest against certain misty sayings of Professor Housman's. As for the vexed question as to the date at which the poem was composed, Mr. Garrod suggests that books i and ii were written between A.D. 9 and A.D. 14, book iv. finished in A.D. 14-15. Surely, by the way, the lines 508 sqq. (*quid enim mirabitur ille—sc. Capricornus— | maius, in Augusti felix cum fulserit ortum?*) are no proof that Augustus was living when they were written? The incomplete condition of the work is explained, not, I think, very plausibly, as due to the changed position of astrology after the edict of 16 A.D. 'That edict was directed against astrology as a practicable art. It was directed

against astrology in so far as astrology enables us to cast a horoscope. You can cast no horoscope if you do not allow for the *mixtura* of planets and signs in their influences. Consequently you cannot cast a horoscope by the aid of Manilius' poem as we possess it [the influence of the planets never getting full treatment in it]. . . . The sting of astrology is the planets. The *Astronomica* is astrology without its sting' (lxxii, lxxiii). The estimate of Manilius' literary powers is interesting and judicious.

I have made in the past more than one vain effort to understand this second book of Manilius, and I can appreciate the help given us by Mr. Garrod's work. It is a credit to English scholarship, and fills one with the desire that he should before long give us a text and translation of the whole work. There are a few slips and misprints. Thus, on p. xxiii (l. 16 from bottom) 110 should be 119, and on p. xxiv, after it has been made probable that fol. 44 v of the archetype of G L M ended with III 21, we are told that 'anyone who cares to make the calculation will find that fol. 47 recto must therefore have ended with III. 153.' But the archetype is assumed to have had 22 lines on a page: the extra 132 lines surely require six pages and bring us to fol. 47 verso. On p. 25 *Olympus* has become *Olmypus*; p. 33 (=l. 512) *sublimem* is translated 'huge'; p. 84 the note on 190 runs '*hominis*] *oris* codd.; and *oris* at 172 all save M.' But M. has *hominis* at 190 also; p. 107 l. 30 85 should be 65; p. 144 l. 14, I.M.C. should be O.C.C.; p. 149 l. 3 from the bottom, O.C.C. should be H.O.R.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

Sheffield.

A NEW LATIN GRAMMAR.

A New Latin Grammar. By E. A. SONNENSCHN, D.Litt., Professor of Classics in the University of Birmingham. Pp. 266. Cr. 8vo. One vol. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. 2s. 6d.

PROFESSOR SONNENSCHN'S *New Latin Grammar* is the first systematic attempt to apply to the teaching of Latin Grammar the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology. These recommendations,